Official Court Reporter

25

THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Pfisterer.

MR. PFISTERER: Good morning, Your Honor.

MR. ABELN: Good morning, Your Honor.

MR. PFISTERER: Your Honor, this matter is the United States of America v. John Watson, indexed at Criminal No. CR-00-119-03. Your Honor, I'm standing in for Mr. Behe this morning, and I understand we're here on a motion for the district court to review the detention order of Judge Smyser in this case.

THE COURT: That's correct. Mr. Abeln.

MR. ABELN: Yes, Your Honor, we had an indictment filed on April 12, 2000, and my client appeared the following day after responding to the call of the authorities and turning himself in. We had a detention hearing right on the spot at the time that I was appointed. I did not have a chance to discuss Mr. Watson's background with him at that point and could not really comment to the Court on his resources that he had in the community. I have since now spoken with him and several members of the community and because the trial has been continued twice in this matter, we are asking that the detention be revisited.

THE COURT: Mr. Pfisterer.

MR. PFISTERER: Your Honor, at least initially the government intends to rely on the presumption in this case.

I'm sure, as the Court is aware, because the grand jury found

probable cause to believe that Mr. Watson was involved in a conspiracy to distribute in excess of 50 grams of crack cocaine there is, while it's rebuttable, there is a presumption in favor of his detention in this case because drugs and the harm that they cause is perceived to be a danger to the community.

Also in this case I'd like to point out to the Court's attention that our detention motion was also based on the fact that Mr. Watson has a significant criminal history that does involve drugs, and that in fact he was on parole at the time that he committed this offense, at least that the grand jury found probable cause to believe that he committed this offense, so he was already in a supervised status.

As Mr. Abeln's motion tends to point out, while there are other options available to the Court that would involve supervision, monitoring, living in particular residences, actually that's what he was doing at the time he committed this offense.

This is a conspiracy over a one year period involving a significant amount of cocaine, and there is nothing presented in the motion which would ameliorate the potential harm if Mr. Watson is allowed to be released and to be in a position to continue to sell drugs.

THE COURT: Mr. Abeln, does the defendant have anything to offer this morning to rebut the presumption that

he would pose a danger to our community?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ABELN: His testimony, Your Honor, the fact that he has been a resident of this particular area for a long period of time. He has contacts in the community that would assist him in trying to get a job if he were released.

There is also the aspect we have received a copy of the application for the search warrant which has the probable cause affidavit dealing with the house in question where this conspiracy allegedly took place, and the affidavit is quite detailed, in fact it goes almost 15 pages long, and this is the affidavit that led to the referral to the federal government on the co-defendants which are Larnell Morrison and also Tom Elliot. Throughout the entire warrant there is not one mention of my client, and we are saying that based upon the government's assertion that this is a conspiracy, there has been no evidence whatsoever that has been revealed to me through discovery that links my client to any illegal activity whatsoever, and he feels that he is not guilty of this particular charge and desires a trial in this matter, and his release to assist me in further investigation and verifying the things that he said would greatly help me.

MR. PFISTERER: Your Honor, while those are all matters certainly that the Court can consider and are obviously concerns of the defense, they don't directly go to the issue of dangerousness to the community, and that is what

the Court has to decide here this morning, not whether it would be more convenient or easier for Mr. Watson to do what he needs to do to get ready for trial, and, of course, the fact that an affidavit in an early part of this investigation doesn't disclose much about the defendant says nothing about what the rest of the investigation disclosed or what was presented to the grand jury.

Often in drug cases like this a significant portion of the evidence is witness evidence from people who we tell we will not because we have the ability to protect them, disclose their identity and the information they provided until just prior to going to trial to protect them and for their safety. And the courts here routinely recognize that is our practice that we don't disclose those names and statements until the Friday before Monday's jury selection, and that is probably a significant reason why Mr. Watson doesn't have what appears to be an overwhelming amount of information about what the government's belief is in his role in this conspiracy, but I assure the Court that that evidence exists, that's what was presented to the grand jury, and in due course that will be provided to the defense.

THE COURT: Mr. Abeln, does the defendant dispute the government's representation that he has suffered prior drug convictions and that he was on parole when this alleged offense occurred?

MR. ABELN: No, Your Honor, he has -- and I have asked his state parole officer Miss Jerri Williard, who is in the regional office here in Harrisburg, to appear this morning, but I have only been able to get her answering machine, but I understand through the sources that I have been able to check that he has -- since he's been on parole for an incident that occurred a long time ago in New Jersey, he has had no technical violations during this period of time. He has reported and has not been a concern to the parole people. So only through my client's testimony am I able to present and rebut the concept that he is a danger to the community.

He has been drug free. He has not had any charges against him that would show that since 1989 that shows that he has had any contact with drugs or anything like that, and he does have the opportunity to explain the one charge that has been alleged in the pretrial memorandum services report which indicates that by the Harrisburg Police Department that he had originally been charged with aggravated assault and recklessly endangering, and that charge was dismissed. So other than the possession of cocaine back in 1988, he literally has no prior record.

THE COURT: All right, based on all that I have heard here and on my review of the defendant's motion to review the detention order I find that the magistrate judge

. 9

properly found that no conditions of release would assure the safety of the community or -- assure the safety of the community. I think that the circumstances that the defendant cites in his motion to review the detention order properly go to the defendant's appearance at trial and that this case is governed by United States v. Supa, 799 Fed 2d 115. The order of the magistrate will stand, and the defendant will be detained pending trial.

Mr. Abeln, I think your client has something to say to you. He is raising his hand.

MR. ABELN: He wants to address the Court, and I also -- I have received a couple letters, well, a couple, I have received many letters from Mr. Watson and many phone calls through other people, and I'm not sure whether he is pleased with my representation, and I think that matter should be addressed at this point, whether or not I should be -- I should ask to withdraw.

THE COURT: I know from the clerk's office that Mr. Watson has addressed letters to the Court previously. I believe it's Mr. Watson, is it, Miss Kennedy?

THE CLERK: I believe so.

THE COURT: One of the defendants in this matter has written the Court, and those letters have been returned consistent with my customary instruction to the defendant that they should communicate with the Court only through

counsel.

Mr. Watson, is there an issue with your lawyer here?

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I'm sorry, Your Honor, I just -- I just want to say -- I just want to say just basically in addition, I mean, I understand and I respect the fact that you ruled, okay. In 1988, in 1988, I got caught with drugs in New Jersey. I was 18 years old. I did 6 years. I have been home.

Since I have been home, Your Honor, I have maintained employment. I have kept regular contact with my parole officer. It is through the parole office that I was able to get my job up at the Harrisburg School District working as a security guard, hall monitor. Prior to that job, Your Honor, I worked at Gannett Flemming Engineers and Planners over in Camp Hill on Hartsdale Drive.

My institutional jacket, as well as my street record, has been impeccable. I have went through the director of the parole office, Mr. Fielder, who would no doubt attest to the fact that I have done nothing wrong.

Mr. Juba, the lead investigator in this investigation right here, came out to the county to take me downtown on May -- on June 8. When he came up to the county, he brought a Detective Lau.

With respect to the charge, Your Honor, in 1997

Detective Lau charged me with aggravated assault, reckless endangerment. They realized that they had the wrong person in custody, and subsequently I was released on December 17 after he came out on December 16 at 9:30 p.m. to tell me that they had the wrong person. I sat out at the county for 2 and a half months, Your Honor.

In this particular instance there has, even in the indictment, Your Honor, even in the indictment, the eight counts of the indictment, Your Honor, reflects of an investigation that went on for 14 months, but the actual investigation only went on for a period from September 15 until March 14. The principal subjects of this investigation, Your Honor, were Miss Connie Brown and Larnell Morrison himself, and it was Miss Brown's residence that this alleged activity took place from. Nowhere in this affidavit is my name mentioned. The indictment itself is inconsistent with the affidavit and the period in which the investigation actually took place.

When Mr. Juba came out to the county, he brought

Detective Lau for the mere purposes of him identifying me.

For when I went up to the cage, he asked for John Watson, I

said, "I am John Watson." He said, "You have to be kidding,

I have never seen you before." I said, "Thank you for

confirming that, but I remember seeing you." He said, "Well,

where have you seen me at?" I said, "Me and my fiancee when

you were coming back from a Harrisburg Senators game one day, you and your son," he has a son, between six and eight, "we were at the Dairy Queen on 22, and we were talking about trucks and wild life," which were two of his favorite subjects so he said. I knew that Mr. Juba never knew me.

Your Honor, I stand before you, I am an innocent man. I haven't done anything to violate anyone or to violate the criminal justice system since I was 18 years old.

My mother, my sister, they are sitting here right here, and I have done nothing. I have worked ever since I have been home. I file income taxes every year. Mr. Fielder has worked hand in hand with me in support of all my efforts.

And my position, I got called at 8:30 in the morning, I was running some cars to the Harrisburg auction for a friend of mine who has put me in employment named Jessie Say, he owns Choice Auto, and Dusan Braddock, Your Honor might know Mr. Dusan Braddock. I work for him. I come downtown in good faith because I know that I didn't do anything wrong.

I don't have -- I don't have the financial resources. Since I have been locked up I have lost my job up at the school. I have lost my vehicle and everything. I just don't have the time, the money or the energy to put into this.

It has been very, very mental. It has been a

mental strain on myself and my family, and the only thing that I am asking for, I really don't care what type of supervision, what type of probation, I don't care what it consists of, the only thing I want to do is return home.

I have a three year old daughter that I have custody of that I haven't seen in four months because I'm too embarrassed to have her come out to the county and look at me through glass.

Your Honor, I am 110 percent innocent of any wrongdoing with respect to this matter, and I am begging Your Honor to reconsider my status. Whatever I have to do I will do it I swear.

THE COURT: Mr. Pfisterer.

MR. PFISTERER: Your Honor, while not familiar with all of the details of this case as it is in fact Mr. Behe's case, I would note for the Court that in my file I also have a letter from Mr. Watson. And in that letter Mr. Watson indicates that while he again, as he said here in court, that he hasn't committed this offense, he does acknowledge hanging around with people who continue to lead negative lives and with being chastised by his mother for gambling, playing dice at times with money that he can't afford to lose.

There is also a letter in the file from Mr. Behe to Mr. Watson responding to his constant letters to Mr. Behe where he indicates that because of the vehemence and the

number of letters that Mr. Watson sent him that he asked the investigators to again review the file, reinterview the confidential informants and cooperating witnesses to make sure that there was no mistake in this case and offered Mr. Watson a polygraph which he flunked, and that's why after that review that the charge is still here.

THE COURT: Mr. Watson, we're all at a bit of a disadvantage here today because Mr. Behe, who is the prosecutor in this case, is not here to speak to me about the circumstances of this alleged offense.

The Bail Reform Act requires that this Court find or at least that this Court recognize the finding of the grand jury, and that's what I need to do. The grand jury has found in this case that there is probable cause to hold you on this charge, and I have to respect that.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: So you come into court with a very long presumption that you pose a danger to this community, and I have to respect that. So then the burden becomes yours to show that you are not a danger, and, of course, you're disadvantaged in being able to do that. I hear no evidence today that can rebut the presumption of the grand jury's finding and of your record and the fact that you were on parole when this offense occurred.

I will revisit the question of your detention after

your lawyer has had an opportunity to talk to Mr. Behe about the circumstances of your case and to make any investigation that he's going to do.

Mr. Abeln was on top of this right away, he got you an early hearing, and I know he'll do that again. Are you having problems with Mr. Abeln?

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I have in my hand, I have been trying to get this motion to show cause, a motion to quash this complaint filed against me, before the indictment, Your Honor, fails to charge me with any offense. I am charged with an 846 without an 841, and my understanding of the federal statute, and I know that Your Honor knows what that is, that it submits the defendant by a recent decision by the courts has made it perfectly clear the drug quantities are an essential element of the offense and must be charged in the indictment, submitted to the jury and proven beyond a reasonable doubt.

There is seven consecutive sales, one joint and five individual sales from Larnell to a particular individual.

MR. PFISTERER: Your Honor, I must interrupt. This is completely inappropriate. That is exactly why he has an attorney, to make legal argument, and that's what this is.

It's already obvious it's completely unfounded. That is an issue for trial, not a pretrial issue, to determine -- the

elements of the offense are stated in Count 8, which is what he's charged with, and if he has a legal argument, it should be filed in the form of a motion from his attorney.

THE COURT: Mr. Watson, is what you're trying to say you have some disagreement with Mr. Abeln about whether or not --

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have been begging him to file this motion from the outset.

THE COURT: Mr. Abeln, could you address that.

MR. ABELN: Yes, Your Honor, we had tried to come to an agreement as to whether or not Mr. Behe had sufficient evidence even with the grand jury individual witnesses which he has been unable to share with me as far as their testimony, he has merely said that there are witnesses that will identify my client and that will testify at trial.

The reason for the detention motion is that we had planned originally to go to trial on June 20 and when — which was the date of the scheduled trial, and the co-defendants filed continuance motions of which we opposed, so that we wanted to go forward at the trial, and there would have been no reason to file this particular motion. So in lieu of that, the fact that this matter had been continued, I asked that the Court review the detention order to get him out so that it would solve the same thing.

I'm not sure whether there is sufficient evidence

Mr. Behe has. But as I understand the law, I'm not entitled to know what the grand jury witnesses will say until the time that they are going to testify at trial, and so I felt that a motion to quash the indictment would be futile.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Abeln, it was my understanding that all of the parties agreed to the motion to continue.

MR. ABELN: That was the last motion. The first motion was the one that was filed by Rex Bickley, and on June 9 we had prepared to go to trial on June 20, and in his certificate of concurrence it says on June 9 counsel for the defendant contacted Greg Abeln, counsel for Watson, who concurs with respect to Defendant Larnell Morrison but does not concur with respect to his own client John Watson. Then at that point this matter got continued, and the last time trial had been scheduled I think Mr. Bickley was fired or released from representation, and Mr. West took over the representation of the other individual. The trial had been scheduled at a time when I was in trial in Fulton County, so I couldn't attend that trial, and that was the reason for the last concurrence but not the initial concurrence.

THE COURT: Well, back to the probable cause finding. The grand jury has found probable cause in this case. I don't know what Mr. Behe has against any particular defendant, but I know he's a fair-minded person, and I'm

.21

hoping that you are going to meet with him in the next few days when he is back in the courthouse and see if this is something that you can address with Mr. Behe.

MR. ABELN: That's exactly, now that the detention order has been denied, that's exactly what I intend to do.

THE COURT: If you want to make a motion on the basis of the danger to the community, I will be glad to take it up again.

Mr. Watson, I need to know today before you leave here, I know you may have some quarrels with how Mr. Abeln is handling the case, but he is the lawyer, and you have to defer to his judgment in these matters. Are you able to do that?

THE DEFENDANT: I don't believe I am, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Why not?

unsuccessfully to get this motion filed. I sat out at the county for a month before I seen him and then over two months before I had a chance to see him again. I have been trying to get this motion filed ever since I have been out at the county because, Your Honor, I know that — I know for a fact that there is not one — I offered when I went downtown for interrogation and I asked him bring Mr. Behe upstairs, if you can show me one tangible piece of evidence against myself, that I would plead guilty today, I would plead no contest

Morrison, and you don't see him that often." I said, "Well, that is inconsistent with what you charged me with. You charged me of having knowledge of what you allege this individual is being involved in an ongoing concern." I asked them to show me any tangible piece of evidence and I will plead guilty today, I would plead guilty right now. I know that none exists, Your Honor, none. I wasn't even part of the attorney general's investigation. I was only mentioned on the federal indictment.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Watson, anybody that is assigned to handle your case is going to make certain legal judgments that you, as a lay person, may not always fully understand or appreciate. You're going to be in the position of either representing yourself or having to put your trust in a lawyer who knows the system and understands the law. You need to be thinking about that between now and when I see you again.

THE DEFENDANT: I need new representation, Your Honor, I'm asking for it.

THE COURT: I cannot find on the basis of what you have stated here that you have established the grounds for me excusing Mr. Abeln from this case and assigning you a new lawyer. From what I hear you saying, you're going to have the same problem with any lawyer I give you. If they're not

doing the case the way you want them to do it, then you're going to have a problem with that. That's not how it works.

Do you want to represent yourself?

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, what am I supposed to do, I'm not trying -- I'm asking for any type of information. How am I going to mount any type of defense when I have no -- there is nothing against me. There is nothing. There is nothing on me.

THE COURT: Mr. Watson, why don't you take your seat, and I want to address you and Mr. Abeln. Mr. Abeln, I understand you're going to meet with Mr. Behe in the next few days.

MR. ABELN: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I'll set this on the docket for some day next week, and we can address the matter of detention if that is an issue that is properly brought back before the Court and also the matter of your representation of Mr. Watson.

Mr. Watson appears to be very opinionated, very strong willed and very articulate and intelligent. That doesn't always make for the easiest client, but it is clear to me that he can be of great assistance in his defense in this matter and somebody that you ought to be able to work with, I hope you can, but if it comes to your being excused from the case, we will do that if that's the right thing.

1	All right, anything else? Mr. Pfisterer.
2	MR. PFISTERER: Not by the government, Your Honor.
3	THE COURT: All right, we'll be in recess.
4	(The proceedings concluded.)
5	I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence
6	of the court are contained fully and accurately in the notes
7	taken by me on the hearing to review the detention order of
. 8	the within cause and that this is a correct transcript of the
9	same.
10	
11	Monica L. Zamisha
12	Monica L. Zamiska, RPR
13	Official Court Reporter
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	·
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	